REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-21 in the application. In a previous response, the Applicants amended Claims 1, 8, and 15 with limitations from Claims 5, 12, and 19, respectively, and canceled Claims 5, 12, and 19 without prejudice or disclaimer. In the present response, the Applicants have added Claims 22 and 23. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in paragraphs 30 and 32 and Figure 2 of the original specification. No other Claims have been amended or canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-23 are currently pending in the application and in condition for allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,079,860 to Yamamoto, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,216 to Pugel, *et al.* The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner recognizes that Yamamoto does not teach or suggest that the inductor is configured to resonate proportionally to a frequency with a first capacitance associated with a plurality of transistors. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner relies on column 10, lines 31-51 of Pugel. (*See* Examiner's Action of October 4, 2007, pages 2-3.) Pugel, however, does not teach or suggest an inductor, coupled between a common source of a plurality of transistors and a current generator, configured to resonate proportionally to a frequency with a first capacitance associated with the plurality of transistors. Instead, Pugel teaches an output portion of RF amplifier 905' includes a single FET Q1 in a common source configuration. An inductor LA' is configured between V_{CC} and the drain of the transistor and is used to resonate with the parasitic capacitance at the drain

of FET Q1. (*See*, for example, column 10, lines 31-39, and Figure 8.) Thus, Pugel teaches an inductor, coupled between a drain of a single transistor and a power supply, configured to resonate with the parasitic capacitance of that single transistor. Pugel, however, does not teach or suggest an inductor, coupled between a common source of a plurality of transistors and a current generator, configured to resonate proportionally to a frequency with a first capacitance associated with the plurality of transistors and recited in independent Claims 1 and 8.

Unlike Pugel, the result of the configuration as presently claimed is an inductor configured to resonate with the base-emitter capacitance of the plurality of transistors or the gate-to-source capacitance of a plurality of transistors. (*See*, for example, paragraphs 33 and 44 and Figures 2 and 5 of the original specification.) Pugel, however, is concerned with configuring an inductor to resonate with the parasitic capacitance at the drain of a single FET and, as such, would yield a different result than the configuration as presently claimed. As such, Pugel does not cure the deficiencies the Examiner recognizes Yamamoto to have. Since Pugel does not cure Yamamoto, the cited combination of Yamamoto and Pugel does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1 and 8 and allow issuance of the pending claims.

Additionally, with regard to newly added dependent Claims 22 and 23, the Applicants fail to find where the cited combination of Yamamoto and Pugel disclose wherein the plurality of transistors is greater than two or the plurality of transistors is four as recited in Claims 22 and 23.

II. Rejection of Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Pugel and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,154 to Sano, *et al.* The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As established above, the cited combination of Yamamoto and Pugel does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claims 1 and 8. Analogously, the cited combination of Yamamoto and Pugel does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 15. Sano has not been cited to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination of Yamamoto and Pugel but to teach wherein a plurality of transistors and a current generator form a portion of a system selected from a group consisting of a quadrature oscillator buffer, a quadrature oscillator, and a quadrature mixer. (*See* Examiner's Action of October 4, 2007, page 3.) Additionally, the Applicants fail to find where Sano cures the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination of Yamamoto and Pugel. As such, the cited combination of Yamamoto, Pugel, and Sano does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-21 and allow issuance of the pending claims.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-23.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: January 4, 2008

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800